(not to be destroyed)

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

Settlers Family file no. 40.
Revenue 256-1181: 1-2, 8 April 1912
51-12 & 13, 136, 984, 8 April 1914
— " — 9 & 10, 7 Dec 1912

File No. 42-18

Serial Nos. 1-10

1918.

Later references.

SH 46-888: 1, 3, 4, 5a, 6-10, 8 Jan 1920
SJ 189-20-2, 3, 7 & 9
(17 Def 200-22
SM 62-25-1 & 2.
SM 40-25-164 & 10 & 11.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

SH 95-33 (3, 4, 5)
~~SH 305-34 (3, 4, 5)~~
— — ~~Def 42/3~~ — —
SH 398-36 (1-3)
SRA 4-418 Serial Nos. 10 1, 2, 3.

Part B for August 1919

SUBJECT.

Distribution of the pension drawn by Akkajammanni of Anekal Pollegar Family. ~~Secretary~~.

To

the Comptroller No. H 1176 of 14.8.1919.

Directs that the vacant pension of Rs. 222-6-10 may be registered in the name of the eldest heir - Veera Chikka Rayar with effect from 3rd October 191. and that he should divide the pension equally between himself and his two brothers.

W D 1250—GPB—30,000 - 28-1-19

G. R. S. III—1] 1918.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(SM)

NOTES.

File No. 42/18.

FILE HEADING.

Anekal Pallayar Family Pensions.

From

The Private Secretary to H. H.

No. 2144 Dated 27. XI. 18 Received 30. XI. 18

Diary No. 1444	Enclos. 1	Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Forwards the petition of Nanjarayar & Puttusamirayar of Anekal praying for the division of the family pension drawn by late Akkajammanni into 4 shares & registered in their names separately

NOTES AND ORDERS.

A. 255-11 (1+2) C
A. 57-12 (9+10) E
A 57-12 (13+14) D

Kind reference is invited to notes & discussions in the reference files put-up regarding the prayer of the deceased lady — Akkajammanni Avaru for the devolution of the pension drawn & the claims put in by the petitioners & other claimants

NOTES—First Sheet.

WD 1282—GPB—20,000—18-11-1c

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

SRA File No. 42 of 1918

Serial No.	
	claimants to the division of the pendia 2) Draft submitted forwarding the petition to Khazana Bakshi for report if forwarded. 3) Issued 21/12 16. XII. 18 20
2	To Comptroller No. M. 3084 & 23.12.18 Forwards the petition for report.
	From Comptr. No. S/52 & 16.2.19. States that the report will be submitted after receipt of information from the Dattikoor & Hosur. Called for information 4) Another reminder will be issued if the report is not received by the 10th of next month. 22.2.19 28
3	From The Comptroller No 33. dated 21. April. 19. Submits the Report called for in Serial 2. D: 3008.
4	Petition from Veera Chickaraya of Anekal.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1799—GPB—60,000—20-8-18—S.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | SHA File No. 42 of 1918.

Serial No.

re Succession of a monthly pol
pension of Rs 226-6-10. from the Govt.
Mysore. Granted to Rani Akkajammo
of Anekal who is now deceased —

Submitted
[illegible]
16-5-1914

O + X

5) It is clear from the order of 28.1.89 & 5.2.89
by Sir K. Seshadri Iyer & approved by
late H. H. Chamaraja Wodayar Bahadur
that the pension drawn by late Akkajam-
-manni should descend to her adopted son
Vera Chickkarayer after her death.

adopted son's
Son

6) Kind reference is invited to Mr. C. S.
Baladandayam Iyer's note of 30. 10. 1911
& Mr. K. R. Srinivasiengar's note of 23. 9. 13

(... 25-11) — X
...15-SHA-12) E

Submitted for orders

[illegible]
20.5.14

E

7) For a brief history of this family
please see Pgs. 3 to 5 in SHA 57-12-13.

V

8) A copy of G.O. of 30.7.93 sanctioning the
increase of 50 p.c. to the Pallegars family is put up.

[illegible]
21/5.

9) The papers for Disposal
are.

Enclosures of P. U. D. I

(1) Petition of Nanjanagud
Puttasami Rayaru - yuv
rajah of Kalahastiswara

P. U. D. II. (2) Petition of V. Chayaru.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | SJA File No. 42 of 1918.

Serial No.

The points for consideration in this case are

(1) Whether in accordance with the Govt of 5.2.1889, the pension drawn by AK Kaja-mamni should descend to Veera chickaray-ru, in full or subject to any alteration at the discretion of Govt.

(2) Whether the 2 brothers of Veera chickaray-ru, or the other relatives did have any other share in the said pension. Or

(3) Whether as recommended by the Collr the pension did lapse to Govt in the Special circumstances of the case -

(1) Point No. 3 may be disposed of first -

The pension of AK Kajamanmani is one of those marked to in the Khazana book Statement as on 31st May 1870. to lapse on the demise of the barawardar for want of lineal heirs in the male line - in accordance with the old ruling referred to in para 6 of Govt of 29.10.87. In that order however Govt communicated a liberal policy in the matter of continuing pallya pensions in favour of adopted sons, and Govt having recognised the adoption of chickaray as father of the present claimant Veerachickaryan and expressly declared the latter as entitled to succeed to the pension on

X

P. U. D. II.

P. U. D. I. Enclosure

P. U. D. I

D

Z.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-9-18—S.

General and Revenue Secretariat. | SM File No. 42 of 1918.

Serial No.

The death of AKKaj ammani in the
60 of 5.2.1889, the question of Lapse
does not arise at all.

X

Yes, provided Veera chickkarayas claim remains alive & in tact upto the date of AKKajamanmis death. GM 29/5

11) The main issue therefore is,
whether chickaraya was shd be declared
~~es~~ entitled to succeed to the pension in full
to the exclusion of his brothers, or without
any liability to share the pension with any
other relatives.

12) In this connection reference is invited to
the Khazana books his report 29-11-88,
and specially to pages 5, 6 & 7 thereof, which
explain the circumstances of the case, and
the considerations which apparently influenced
Govt in passing the order of 5.2.89, re-
-cognising the right of Veerachickaraya
to succeed.

A

X

H

13) From the endorsements issued by Govt
on the representations made by AKKaja-
-mmani to claim the order of 5.2.89
modified in favour of his grand-daughter
Govt have more than once declared their
intention of reconsidering that order in
~~their~~ favour if necessary, when the pension actually
fell vacant.

14) The grand-daughter Kaveriyammani is also
now dead, and it appears that the

Re the ground that Veera Chickaraya ani had ide-
-serted and deserted her and married a 2nd wife

b) This is the point. GM 29/5

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

This is not a correct interpretation of the Govt orders. Govt have not committed themselves to any reconsideration of

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | SJA File No. 42 of 1918.

Serial No.

are no persons in the direct line, male or female, who can now validly lay any claim to share in the position of the family — Some connection between the families of Chickarayaru with that of the Anekal family had been traced by the Khyame Bakshi in his report, so as to justify his recommendation for the descent of the position of the latter family in that line, and the declaration that Chickaraya-aru the late by of it to the exclusion of his brothers was due to the close of the first partner cementing of the 2 families by the intended marriage of Chickarayaru with Malliyamamni —

Vide. Chickaray M

Vide - Chickaray M
Hiriyamani. M

15) Tho' the marriage did take place, it did not prove happy and did not result in any issue — ——

16) Whether Chickaraya-aru ill-treated his wife (Maliyamamni) and deserted her and married a 2nd wife with or without justification, it is unnecessary to consider at present —

Vide - Chickaraya M
Hiriyammani M

17) He can lay claim to the position by virtue of the recognition by first of the adoption of his father Chickarayaru to the line, and in this view of the

21) Yes, but if that be his sole claim why should the other brothers who stand in the same footing be denied?

M 29/5

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-3-18—S

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | SM File No. 42 of 191 8

Serial No.

shd. lie for the permitted benefit of the pension to the exclusion of his brothers, who would have an interest in the father's property under Hindu Law but for the express declaration in the Govt of 5-2-1869

18) It would be necessary here to cite first members minutes of 14-12-13 & 21-1-14, in which this point was raised, but left open for consideration and decision when the pension actually fell Vacant.

19) Venkatachalapathy himself admitted in his petition of 25-8-1913 that he would have to share the pension which devolved on him with his younger brothers.

20) The pallayam pensions are picked out at a high figure, and have been enhanced more than once having regard to the high standard of living, apparently on the ground that on the pensioner's life depend a considerable no: of relatives for support.

21) The pension of Rs 8-4-7 Savarikkaj ammani was raised also with others by Govt: orders of 1907

If Govt: shd now finally decide Venkatachalapathy on the ground

8) A declaration made on the petition of the pensioner who applied withdrew his recommendation

SM 51-12 29/5

E Papers 16 & 17

9) Yes, the time for consideration is now come

29/5

B

V.

20) Yes, but that is a big if which the Complr does not accept

29/5

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-3-19—

1897
2150
1895
3057

Y

General and Revenue Secretariat.

S M File No. 42 of 1918

Serial No.

pension, it is a point for consideration whether suitable shares in it should not also be allotted ~~in it~~ to the 2 brothers of his own living, for their life -

X

22) If as already decided in the Case of 8.2.1887 the brothers be entirely excluded, the circumstances of this case do not justify the continuance of the pension of 222-6-10 in full -

No - not even a part, I think - M 29/5

X 29/5

title to succeed to

23) The pension granted in the order of 8.2.89 was in respect of the circumstances of 14.8.47 only, and the limit of the subsequent enhancement in 1893 of Sopi Cannot rightly be conceded to Varadacharyar - ro, because he will enjoy the pension alone, and not have any large no of dependents and relations to support.

V

Fleet 24) The ruling they may 18 also be consulted.

24/5/19.

2818

26) I agree with the Comptr that the pension should lapse to Govt. To the Secy with compliments for opinion. M 29/5

27) I regret I am unable to agree with the H Secy & the Comptroller Whatever may have been

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

position in 1862 + 1870, the validity of adoption (duly recognised) to ensure succession to these pallegar pensions has been definitely set at rest by the Govt. order of 29 Oct 1887. It would be a breach of faith to go behind that order at present & declare the pension lapsed to Govt.

Z.

28) The next question is as to who is entitled to the pension at present. In the Fo. of 5th Feby 1884 the adoption of Chikanayar (father of petrs) was recognised in pursuance of the policy laid down in 1887. Under the operation of ordinary rule of Hindu Law the adoption would at once have had the effect of vesting the pension in the adopted son, but on certain considerations the Govt stayed the operation of the law and directed the continuance of the pension to Akkajammanni (the adoptive mother) during her lifetime & directed that after her death the pension should descend to Chikaveeranayar - the eldest son of the adopted son - who was married to the natural born granddaughter of Akkajammanni.

X

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 1233—GPB—60,000—1-12-16—S.

Serial No.

29) Except in regard to the power reserved to Govt as to the recognition or non-recognition of an adoption for purpose of the devolution of a pension, I am doubtful whether it ~~is~~ within the Competence of Govt or whether it is consonant with good policy & expediency to interfere with the devolution of the pension in accordance with law. Now that the palegars have lost all political importance & influence, it is quite unnecessary to treat these pensions ~~as troops~~ in the same manner as impartible estates ~~existing~~ descending by primogeniture. Such a course has not been adopted in the case of other palleyar pensions which have been divided among those entitled to it under the ordinary Hindu Laws

30) In this case for the reasons stated above, the direction ~~that the pens~~ in the order of 1889 that the pension should descend to the Chikka ~~veera~~ rayan - to the exclusion

X

vera

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

ND 1283—GPB—60,000—1-12-16—S.

Serial No.

of his father (the son adopted to the family) & his brothers cannot be supported.

31) Moreover the special circumstance that at the time, viz that Veera Chicka Veera rayar had married a natural born grand daughter of Akkayamma-mi, have ceased to exist, as that granddaughter lived separate from her husband & has died leaving no issue.

32) There is thus no more reason to show any special consideration to Veera Chikaraya

33) The parties now entitled to the pension are the three surviving sons of Chikaraya - the adopted son of Akkayamma-mi - viz Veera chikarayar, Ranga rayar & Puttasami rayar

34) I do not think the minor daughter of the deceased Sankara Rayar can come in for a share.

35) The pension may therefore be divided equally between the three brothers named a

To file with } CBK
Compliments } 2/6

SECRETARIAT.
BANGALORE.
2 - JUN 1919

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | S & A. File No. 42 of 1918—

Serial No.

2847/5/6

D

Flores)

18
5/16/9

36)

1) The stipend of Akkaji Ammanni was specially declared in the authoritative list of 31.5.1870 as one "to lapse on demise" of the recepient.

2) On her special representation, it was afterwards ordered that the stipend would descend to a particular nominee of hers.

Her adoption was not recognized for the purpose of descent of her pension in ordinary course. The adopted son was to have no right in it nor his sons other than the one who married her granddaughter.

In fact as a special favour to her a life-stipend was allowed to descend to a special nominee other than her adopted son.

3) Akkajammani afterwards petitioned just to say that she did not want that nominee to get the pension after her death. She nominated her daughter and granddaughter both of whom are now

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

4) The stipend was ~~spoke~~ clearly stated to be a life-stipend in curia distinction to many other stipends which were hereditary. The adopted son had never any right to it. The special favour which Govt wanted to shew in the order of 1889, viz. to allow the pension to descend to three generations, she afterwards said she did not want & the favour which she asked for in 1913, viz. that the pension should descend to her daughter & grand-daughter for life was not sanctioned by Govt.

X

37) In these circumstances, the stipend I think clearly lapses—

M
8/8/19

1st Member
Dewan

B

38) P.S.— The fact that even in 1913 Akkaji Ammani prayed for the continuance of the stipend to her daughter & her grand-daughter during their life only clearly shews that she was quite aware that her pension was not of the hereditary class but a life-stipend only specially intended to be continued for one generation more. M

1903
9.6.19

General and Revenue Secretariat. | SH File No. 42 of 1918.

Serial No.

Cases of succession to Collegate pensions involve both legal and quasi-political considerations. While succession is as a rule ~~governed~~ by Hindu Law principles, the State has a right to regulate the mode of succession in disputed cases. Adoption is permitted, but it must be made from the next of kin and with the previous sanction of Government. The former has also the right to divide a pension in such proportion as it thinks fit among several persons, and to diminish the amount of pension when renewing it in any case.

If these principles are borne in mind, cases like the present need not present any undue difficulty.

Too much is made in the Financial Secretary's note of the fact that the stipend given to the Anekal Collegate was shown in the Khazana Book's Statement of 1870 as one liable to lapse on the demise of the then holder. That was simply due to the circumstance that the holder, the late Akkajiammanni, was a widow who had no male issue of her body

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat. | SM File No. 42 of 1918.

Serial No.

2

1

X

But after the change of pol
announced in the Govt Order of 29
Oct 1887, and the recognition, in a
cordance with the new policy, of th
adoption of Chikkaraya by Akka
ammanni, the position was entire
changed. Subsequent Statements
Khazana Bakhis (see, for instanc
the one for 1914) no longer show th
pension in question as a non-here
stipend.

The hereditary character of t
stipend is in no way affected
the reservations made by Govern
in their Order of 5-2-1889 when recog
nising the above adoption. An
adoption by a Hindu widow has, as
rule, the consequence that it imm
diately divests her of her estate; bu
in this instance Govt said that the
enjoyment of the pension by Akkaji
ammanni should not be dis-
turbed during her life-time. The
also laid down that after her
death the pension should descend
not to the adopted son himself
to his eldest son Veerachikkaraya

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat. | S/A File No. 42 of 1918.

Serial No.

whom it was proposed to marry to the Ds lady's grand-daughter. Subject to these conditions, the adopt had the effect which it was intend to have, and which every valid adoption has ordinarily under Hin Law, of continuing the line of heir which would otherwise become extin

Nothing that has happened since affects the position, either. What Government said* when the matter came up in 1912 on the petition of Akkayiammanni and her grand-daughter was that "the question revising the order of 1889 in rega to the devolution of the pension can be considered when the pensionary allowance falls vacant." There w no question at all, either then or when the matter was re-agitated in 1914#, of the pension lapsing for want of legal heirs, and no idea in contem plation of its being resumed by Government; but merely a ques of regulating the devolution of the pens when the succession should open on the death of the then holder.

* Ind. Dy. S. R.-12 (File 255-11)

X

File 51-12

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

2

It would not be either right or politically expedient for the State to take advantage of Akkajiammanni's death to resume the stipend in its entirety. We should hardly be giving its due effect to the "liberal policy" of 1887 by doing so. The line of reasoning which was revived by Chikkaraya's adoption has not in any wise become extinct thereafter, and the only question that has now to be considered by Government is, How should the pension be allotted, that is, to whom and with what deductions if any?

The main anxiety of Akkaji-ammanni all along was that the pension should ensure for the benefit of her granddaughter Hiriyammanni and her issue; and with this feeling the Government of the day evidently sympathised to a large extent. Hiriyammanni too is since dead without having any children of her own, her husband Veerachikkaraya has children by another wife, but that is a different matter. The records (even those produced by the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

Veerachikharaya himself) leave little room for doubt that Hiriyamma was ill-treated by her husband and that the marriage was on the whole an unhappy one.

I therefore agree with the Chief Secretary that Veerachikharaya is no longer entitled to any special consideration by the reason of his brothers, and that the pension should be divided equally among the surviving sons of the deceased Chikkharaya (the original assessee son).

It seems to me, at the same time, that the circumstances are such as to warrant a material reduction in the aggregate amount of the pension. But perhaps, on division into three shares will operate to reduce the portion falling to each to one-third of Rs 222-6-10, it may be sufficient to make a nominal reduction, say to Rs 210, or to Rs 180, so as to give each sharer Rs 70 or Rs 60, as the case may be. This will also serve to emphasise the fact of the Government to reduce the amount of a pension

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

SHA File No. 42 of 1918.

Serial No.

in suitable cases, just as it has been pleased to increase the same on various occasions.

Dewan)

28/6

Respectfully submitted in Council

30 6

C.S.

Circulate

30/6/19

Since the legal & other aspects of the case have been dealt with in detail by both the Ch. Secy & the Dist Member it will serve no useful purpose to the same being repeated. I am also to add that to the reasons put forwards by him, I agree with the Ch. Secy in the recommendations made by him. The view taken by the Comptroller & the Dis Secy is untenable in my opinion.

2-7-19

I agree with the Hon Member in thinking that the present day

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

not lapse. The Financial dept does not deem it necessary to amend the provisions of the Act under which legs duties are imposed & the Govt would regard it as undesirable to alter existing provisions. Para 8 of that note is very unsatisfactory & I make no apology for expressing it so. It runs as follows: —

"Under such circumstances obligations would arise & questions might be raised as to the extent to which succession duty was payable on the same property & successive deaths within short intervals. In the case of successive deaths in a person dying adopted and applying the same rule of succession as applies to Naïr property. In the case of successive deaths in a person dying adopted and applying the same rule of succession as applies to Naïr property would be in the second case not only needless but fundamentally incorrect. Under Law & the succession is that which would obtain under Nairs but also needless & unjust in

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | 318 File No. 42 of 1918

Serial No.

further in this matter."

Sara q makes his rubisely q adoptn depended upon this hosp: his beg his Sovereign & when he in his under q 1059, his wife required his adoptn. Now under what can it be contended that his powers lapse when his lineal descendants q his adopted son are capable q intend his wife q his next relation q his powers in her respect are quite his personal, nor his making which reflected could first in respecting his adoptn.

The next question is whether Christmas his adopted son q Akbar Jamee is entitled when male powers q whether he has to share his Salary equally with his brothers. Under his under q 1059, his powers has to descend to him in his death q Akbar Jamee his under for beyond his scope q his under q 1057 — the his adoptn being recognised full scope

Here. I reject Mamu & differs from his last Memorandum & his Counsel Secretary —

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-3-18—S.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

S/H File No. 42 of 1918.

Serial No.

x.

In these words his adopted son has declared the credible & his pension - post. Our consideration seems where we should be just & we not only confirmed his pension in his name of Akbar Jamma but ordered & his adopted son to receive his pension after his death, & ordered to which he was entitled & his adopted for ——

that has been given to his wife & children as an appanage to Palanpur (Langs. x) they were to pay as it under the direction of the pensioned deceased Akbar Jamma Cassim & the Ultra Vires - he pension should be confirmed in accordance with his wife & successors retaining with appanage to Palanpur lands, and that his these lands from an important & valuable asset the Empire undivided If that is the case, his & each heir ought his claim from & heir ought to be entitled & his full pension subject & his legal & maintenance & his expenses -

Post. Supposing that his wife & children during that his pension should be & each heir ought to his death & Akbar Jamma since Ultra Vires, then it is clear from the language & his order that it was intended to make & each heir ought his & his pension from Akbar Jamma. The fact that he has married his daughter's daughter Akbar Jamma must have been

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-3-18—S.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

S.A. File No. 42 of 1918.

Serial No.

an important factor that influenced the decision of the Govt in the former case was that he ill treated his wife and that she was living separate from him. This cannot in any way affect her right, nor the subsequent request of Akkayamma that the pension in her favour be cancelled. The object of the Pollegar pension is not only to afford a means of maintenance to these ancient families but also to enable them to maintain their prestige and dignity ~~of their families~~ and the ~~prestige & dignity~~ cannot be secured if the pension is divided & subdivided. By the Go no [illegible] of 1909 permission is given to the Palegar family to keep a musket & 4 pieces with distinctive weapons & these points to the intention of the Govt to keep in tact the dignity & the social position and status of the family. I am therefore of opinion the pension is indivisible and that the holders of such pensions are entitled only to maintenance. Just as Palayapat lands cannot

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

SDA File No. 42 of 191 P.

Serial No.

be taken away by his work and cannot be moved hereafter, so his pension should his salary cannot be sustained - ~~the Army~~ ~~for~~ ~~have~~ ~~be~~ enhanced his pensions which he would not have done if his policy was sustained & eventually to ~~be~~ issue his same which will be his retrenchment his policy & decrease & Sub-division if it be pursued by ~~us~~ himself as is proposed

3/7

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-3-18—S.

No. C. 1

(For disposal at a meeting)

1.7. 191.9

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

S. Council Matter.

SUBJECT.

(Clause xiii of the Schedule)

Claimants to the pension drawn by the late Akkajammanni of the Anekal Pollegar Family.

CIRCULATED TO THE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

By Order,

C S Balasundaram Ayyar

1st July 1919. Chief *Secretary to Government.*

Extraordinary Member of Council.

First Member of Council. seen.

Second Member of Council. 5 opinion recorded Peel 2.7.19

Third Member of Council. Perin Mendes 2/7/19

5620 2.7.19

GPB—1,000—28-8-14

(25)

Extract from the Proceedings of the 496th *Meeting of the Council of His Highness the Maharaja, held at Bangalore on the* 11th July *1919*

---

6. Subject.-Clause xiii of the Schedule.

Claimants to the pension drawn by the late Akkaja manni of the Anekal Pollegar Family.

Opinion of the Council.

The pension may be registered in the name of the eldest heir Veerachickaraya but with the direction that he should divide the pension equally between himself and his two brothers.

Sd. A.R.Banerji,

Offg. Dewan of Mysore.

"EXTRACT'

C S Balasundaram Jr

Chief Secretary to Government.

WD 1149—GPB—1,000—23-12-18

(26)

WD—A2089—GPB—500—1-5-18

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C. 1.

SM File No. 42 of 1918.

*23. As soon as circulation is complete and the opinion of the Council is recorded, the file will be forwarded to the Secretary in the Department concerned for transmission if need be to the Financial Secretary under Standing Orders and for submission to the Dewan or Member in charge.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Council is put up.

Forwarded with compliments to the Secretary to Government, Financial Department, under *Rule 23 of the Subsidiary Rules of Council Business.

By Order,

C S Balasundaram
Chief Secretary to Government.

Draft
12.7.19
D.S.N Lilir Draft-order
14-7-19

Draft D.S.N with a draft-order Submitted

18/7/19

Mean put-up a typed D.S.N & Draft-order as desired - Hesketh
21.7.19

Typed D.S.N & order Submitted.

24/7

Hesketh

24/7/19

25/7/19

25/7

DEWAN'S OFFICE.
Recd. on JUL 25 1919
Reg. No. 647

Dewan

NOTE.—Cotn. Sheet.

Submitted to His Highness.

The accompanying papers relate to the disposal of the Pollegar pension of Rs.222-6-10 drawn by the late Akkajammanni of the Anekal Pallegar Family who died on 2nd October 1918.

2. The claimants to the pension are (1) Veera Chicka Royar, the eldest son of Chicka Royar --the adopted son of th late Akkajammanni, and (2) his two younger brothers, viz., Nanja Royar and Puttuswami Royar, and they have severally petitioned to Government urging their claims.

3. The facts of the case briefly are as follows:-

In the order of 5th February 1889, the adoption of Chick Royar (father of the petitioners) by Akkajammanni was recognised by Government in pursuance of the liberal policy laid down in their Order of 1887; the pension was, however, conti nued to Akkajammanni (the adoptive mother) during her lifetime, and it was declared that after her death it should descend to Chickaveera Royar, the eldest son of the adopted son to whom it was proposed to marry Hiriyammanni, the granddaughter of Akkajammanni. For reasons alleged in the several memorials addressed to His Highness, the late Akkajammanı requested Government to modify the Order of 5th February 188 in favour of her daughter Malligammanni and of her granddaughter, Hiriyammanni, and after an enquiry into Akkajjamma nni's prayer as directed by His Highness, it was decided tha the question of the devolution of the pension would best be considered only after her death.

4. In reporting upon the relative claims of the petitioners, the Comptroller, for reasons recorded in his letter of 21st April 1919, recommended that the pension should lapse Government. The Financial Secretary, Mr.Chakravarti, agre in this view.

Pages 8 to 11 of office Note

The Chief Secretary, Mr.C.S.Balasundaram Iyer, in his note dated 2nd June 1919 suggested that the vacant pension be divided equally between the three brothers named above. The First Member of Council, Mr.K.S.Chandrasekhara Iyer, concurred

Page 18 of -do-

with the Chief Secretary.

5. The question having been referred to Council, the

Page 19 of -do-

Second Member, Mr.P.Raghavendra Rao, minuted his approval of the views of the Chief Secretary and of the First Member,

Page 23 of -do- Mr Mr Hussain

while the Third Member opined that the pension should descend to Veera Chick Royar, his two brothers being entitled to maintenance.

6. The question was discussed in all its aspects in Council at a meeting held on 11th July 1919, and they are of opi-

Page 25 of -do-

nion that the pension may be registered in the name of the eldest heir, Veera Chicka Royar, with the direction that he should divide the pension equally between himself and his two brothers.

Draft for approval

7. The resolution of the Council and the draft order prepared according to their opinion are submitted for His Highness' gracious approval.

Illegible

26th July 1919

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders of His Highness the Maharaja

Subject.

Disposal of the vacant Pollegar pension of the Anekal family.

200

Order.

~~KRW~~
31/7/19

H. Lee
1.8.19

3/8-1-1.

C. 1

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

S & A File No. 42 of 1918.

Serial No.

*)

31. All urgent or confidential files returned with His Highness' orders may, in the absence of instructions or indications to the contrary, be ordinarily circulated to the Members of Council for perusal after the issue of orders.

33. The Secretaries concerned should see that orders in the cases referred to above are issued at once and that the files are returned immediately after to the Chief Secretary for circulation to the Members.

34. In all other cases, the files will first be circulated to the Members of Council at headquarters and then sent to the Secretariat concerned for the issue of orders.

Circulated to the Members of Council for perusal of (*) His Highness' orders ~~before~~ / ~~after~~ issue of orders. (*Vide* Rules 31, 33 and 34 of the Subsidiary Rules for the conduct of business of Council in the Manual of Council Rules and Procedure).

C Balasundaram
Chief Secretary to Govt. 1/8/19

To:

Through the Secretary to Government,

.....Finance.....Department.

1.8.19

925-70
5.8.19.

FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL
6.8.19

554
2-8-19

SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL
5/8

555
2.8.19

~~TEMPORARY~~ MEMBER OF COUNCIL.
2/8/19

Assent
7/8

NOTE.—Contn. sheet

WD 1573—GPB—500—4-3-19

General and Revenue Secretariat.

SM File No. 42 of 1918.

Serial No.	
8	To Camp Keller, No Fl 1176 dy 14.8.19 Directs that the Vacant pension of ~~Rs~~ 222-6-0 be registered in the name of the eldest heir - Vera Chickka Rayar with effect from 3rd Oct 1918 & that he should divide the pension equally between himself & his two brothers. Two endorsements to the petitioners are submitted for approval. Issued 26/8 22.8.19. 25 Mr. Fl 1654 dy 30.8.19.
9	To M. Rly P. Ramjarayar & Puthusami Rayar Informed the order of Sl: 8.
10	To MAR Vera Chickka Rayar; No 1655 dy 30/8/19 — Do —

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

D 1494

SDA 42-18-1

No. 2144/1.

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY

TO HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,

Mysore, dated 27th November *1918*

15962

Petition, as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja is ~~transferred~~ to the Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, ... ~~Department,~~ Bangalore, for disposal.

No. 313 of 18-19.

By Order,

Private Secretary
to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GBPM—1,000—30-4-18

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 1494

Section SW

File No. 42-18

Serial No. 2

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT,

(SW)

, the *191* .

No. H 3084

Date of issue 23d Decr/18

Signed by W Sreenivasaya

To

The Camp Collector

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith a petition No D. 1494 dy. 27. XI. 18 from M. R. Ry Ranjavoyer o Puttuswami Rayer of Brekal Pallean dainly praying for the division of the punkin drawn by Kale Abbakja-nnanni etc, for favor of enquiry & report

Thanieke

18

21/Decr.

Der H Tahsildar

to be returned with the reply

16/12

D 2899 35

S&A 42-18-3

Please address all future communications to the Comptroller to the Govt. of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.
In reply to this Comm. please refer to
No. 33/63 Encl. 1

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

Dated, Bangalore, the 4th Apr *191* 9.

Fin 2 68153

FROM

M. N. KRISHNA RAO, ESQ., B.A.,
Offg. Comptroller to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

To

Rajamantrapravina
Dewan Bahadur J. S. Chakravarti....., ESQ., M.A., F.R.A.S.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
.....FINANCIAL.....*Department.*

SIR,

I have the honour to submit the following report as called for in your No.Fl.3084/S & A 42-18 dated 23rd December 1918 forwarding the petition of Nanja Rayaru and Puttaswami Rayaru representing their claims to the pension of Rs.222-6-10 drawn by the late Akkajammanni of the Anekal Pollegar family.

2. The petitioners are the younger brothers of Veera Chicka Rayaru who has applied to the State Huzur Treasury Officer for the grant of the whole pension of Rs.222-6-10 to himself on the strengt of Government Order No.6925-6/667 dated 5th February 89. The claimants to the pension are therefore ~~those~~ three ~~that~~ brothers who are the sons of Chick Rayaru whose adoption by Akkajammanni was recognized by Government in their order No.6925-6/667 dated 5th February 89. Chick Rayaru has another son called Shankara Rayaru who is no longer alive but has left three minor daughters who are under the protection of the two brothers Nanja Rayaru and Puttaswami Rayaru.

3. I invite reference to Government Order No.6925-6/667 dat 5th February 89 in which the object of the adoption recognised by Government as also the person to whom the pension was proposed to

be continued on the death of Akkajammanni are clearly stated. It was the desire of Akkajammanni that her grand daughter Hiriyammanni should receive the benefit of the pension. She accordingly proposed that Hiriyammanni should be married to Veera Chicka Rayaru the eldest son of Chick Rayaru whom she proposed to adopt, so that Veera Chicka Rayaru and Hiriyammanni may stand in the relation of cousins who could marry and that her pension should after her death be transferred to Veera Chicka Rayaru for the benefit of her grand daughter Hiriyammanni and of her issue if any. In this order recognising the adoption of Chick Rayaru it was distinctly stated that the pension of Akkajammanni would on her death be transferred only to his eldest son Veera Chick Rayaru because he was the husband of Hiriyammanni and the other sons of Chick Rayaru were not given any interest in the pension. As it was not intended that the other sons of Chick Rayaru should get any share of the pension, I do not think it is necessary to consider the claims of petitioners Nanja Rayaru and Puttaswami Rayaru or of the minor daughters of their deceased brother Shankara Rayaru. The only claim now to be considered is that of Veera Chick Rayaru. As regards this, I would invite reference to Government Order No.Fl.4277/S & A 255-11-2 dated 8th April 1912. This order was passed on the representation of both Akkajammanni and Hiriyammanni. The former apparently found that her kindness to Veera Chick Rayaru had been abused by him and she accordingly prayed to Government that her pensio which accordingly to her representation had been ordered to be transferred to him on her death should not be so transferred to him. Government, however, did not pass final orders on this representation and they directed that the matter would receive consideration when the pension actually fell vacant on her death. The petition to Government of Akkajammanni and Hiriyammanni on which these orders were passed may throw more light on the matter. As stated above the recognition of adoption and the assurance to transfer the pension to Veera Chick Rayaru were both to satisfy the desire of Akkajammanni to provide for her grand daughter Hiriyammanni. In this object she was disappointed and she had therefore to request Government to cancel their order No. 6925-6/667 dated 5th February 89. Veera Chick Rayaru is reported to have forsaken his wife Hiriyammanni and married a second wife. Hiriyammanni is also reported to be dead and to have left no issue

The object of Akkajammanni and of the Government Order No. 6925-6/667 dated 5th February 89 having failed, I do not think it is necessary to continue the pension to Veera Chick Rayaru. I may add that the pension of Akkajammanni is one of those that should lapse on her death as noted in the printed statement of pensioners on 31st May 1870 prepared by the late Mr. Sethu Rao, the Khazana Bhakshi at the time. The petition of Nanja Rayaru and Puttaswami Rayaru is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

M S Ramachandra Rao

Comptroller.

MSR/23-4.

MYSORE COURT FEE FOUR ANNAS

MYSORE COURT FEE FOUR ANNAS

27494

12-10-1

ಶ್ರೀ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 21-10-18 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 222

-6-2) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 5 [illegible] 6925-6/667

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1913 [illegible] 1828 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1914 [illegible]

[illegible] 5240/51-52 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 4 [illegible]

[illegible] 4 [illegible] 21-10-1

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ఆరోగ్యం బాగోలేకపోవడం వలన పరీక్షకు హాజరు కాలేకపోయినందున
ఈ పరీక్షను దయచేసి మరొకసారి నిర్వహించడానికి అనుమతించవలసినదిగా
విద్యార్థిని

P. నందిని రాంబాబు రెడ్డి

పుష్పనాథ రామకృష్ణారెడ్డి

26.11.18

G. R. S. 34)

No: F.L. 5240/S & A.51-12.

GOVERNMENT OF H.H.THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

(S & A.)

Office Memorandum.

To

Dated Bangalore, the 8 May 1914.

Endorsement granted to (1) P.Sankararayal (2) Nanjarayal and (3) Puttasamirayal, Pallegars of Anekal, Bangalore District.

With reference to their petitions dated 18th August 1913 and 8th September 1913 praying for the division of the Anekal Pallegar Pension on the ground of the present pensioner Rani Akkajammanni - Garu having applied to Government to decide the question of succession to the pension after her, the petitioners are informed that their request cannot be granted, as the question of succession or division of pension has not arisen now.

By Order,

Sd./ Lakshmi Narasimha Rau,

For Offg. Secretary to Government.

True Copy.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Read:--

Government Proceedings No: P-P-118-19 dated 28th January 1904 directing the Disbursement to Sughandharaj and Chenniveera Raj of the Hagalvadi Pollegar family, arrears of pension for six months at Rs.80/- each, out of their family pension, registered in the name of their elder brother Basavalingaraj, pending final orders regarding its division among the three brothers.

Also:--

Government Proceedings No: P-P- 53-4 of the 24th November 1903 sanctioning a maintenance allowance of Rs. 30/- per mensem in the name of Devammaji, step mother of Basavalingaraj, out of the pension of Rs. 270/- per mensem registered in his name.

Order thereon:-- No: 139/40 Dated 7th March 1904, deducting the maintenance allowance of Rs. 30/- a month granted to Devammaji, in Government Proceedings of the 24th November 1903 Read above, a pension of Rs.240/- per mensem is now enjoyed by Basavalinga Raj for the support of himself and his two brothers Sugandaraj and Chenniveera Raj. The latter have petitioned this office complaining that their brother has not been paying their shares and praying for the Division of the pension equally among the three brothers. All the brothers who were given a hearing before the Dewan also represent that Devammaji referred to above is not in need of any help out of the family pension and request that the maintenance allowance granted to her may be added to their respective share

2. On a careful consideration of the case the Government of His Highnes the Maharaja are pleased to direct that, pending further investigation on the petitioners allegation about Devammajee's circumstances in life. The orders already passed shall be duly enforced and that the balance of the pension of Basavalingaraj after deducting the maintenance allowance due to Devammajee be equally divided among the three brothers, Basavalingaraj, Sugandharaj and Chennaveeraraj and registered separately in their names.

3. Opportunity must be availed of by the officer in charge, State Huzur Treasury to impress upon these pensioners that the continuance of the pension will depend upon their good conduct and respectability and that they must try to improve themselves by education and other ways..

4. The Huzur Treasury Officer must also use his influence to bring all such stipendiaries to a sense of what is expected of them so as to educate their children and to train them up for some profession or other.

D 3008

SHA 42-18-4

Before Rajamantrapravina

Dewan Bahadur J.S.Chakravarthi, Esq., M.A., F.R.A.S.,

Financial Secretary to the Governm--

of Mysore, BANGALORE.

****

PETITIONER .....Veera Chikka Rayaru

of Anekal.

Subject:- Re the succession to a monthly political pension of Rs 222-6-10 from the Government of Mysore granted to Rani Akkajammanni of Anekal who is now deceased.

****

This is an explanation to be offered to a query put by the State Huzur Treasury Officer, Bangalore, whether there was any ill-treatment to Rani Hiriammanni by her husband (the present petitioner) Veera Chikka Rayaru of Anekal as alleged by Rani Akkajammanni in her memorials to the Government which are supposed to have been addressed by the said Rani Akkajammanni in the years 1911-13, as the petitioner was not in possession of his documentary evidence at the time of the said query.

******

The Government in their Proceedings No. 6925-6/667 dated the 5th February 1889, were pleased to state definitely, inter alia, that after the death of Rani Akkajammanni, the pension should descend to the petitioner who is the grandson of the said Rani Akkajammanni and to whom it was

proposed

proposed to marry Rani Akkajammanni's daughter's daughter.

The petitioner humbly begs to state that Rani Malli-gammanni, mother of Rani Hiriammanni (the petitioner's wife) proposed to marry, much against the will of Rani Akkajammanni (mother of the said Rani Malligammanni), the said Rani Hiri-ammanni to Sugunda Raja of Agalvadi in the year 1891-92 and accordingly the betrothel ceremony was celebrated, Rani Akkajammanni having been disappointed in her wishes to marry her grand-daughter, Rani Hiriammanni of Shulagiri, Salem District, to the present petitioner in accordance with the spirit of the abovenamed Government Proceedings, arranged for a betrothel with one Rani Mahadevammanni, daughter of Raja Sugutur Mommadi Sankara Royal Yesvantha Bahadur of Poonganur Samasthanam, and the betrothel ceremony was per-formed.

Later on, dissensions arose between the Pallegar families of Shulagiri and Agalvadi, and in consequence the betrothel of Rani Hiriammanni with the said Suganda Raja was broken off As a result of this, Rani Hiriammanni of Shulagiri, was after wafds proposed for the second time to the present petitioner whose grand-mother Rani Akkajammanni broke off the betrothel of the Poonganur Pallegar family with the petitioner. Where-upon the disappointed Poonganur Raja filed a petition to the Sub-Collector of the Salem District, not to sanction the alliance of the petitioner with Rani Hiriammanni of Shulagiri - Vide Exhibit A, the petition and Exhibit B, the order of the Madras Government.

In the year 1894 the petitioner's marriage with Rani Hiriammanni was celebrated at Shulagiri. In 1895, Rani Lingarajammanni, the eldest daughter of Rani Malligammanni, who had been married to one of the Pallegars of Agalvadi Samasthanam died. Whereupon Rani Malligammanni owing to this

sad

sad bereavement proposed that Rani Hiriammanni, wife of the petitioner, should stay with her for a time. Accordingly the petitioner sent his wife, Rani Hiriammanni who was pregnant at the time, to Shulagiri to stay with her mother with a view to mitigate her pangs of grief by her constant consolation. After a reasonable length of time the petitioner requested his mother-in-law to send back his wife from Shulagiri to which Rani Malligammanni did not pay any heed, but promised to send her daughter after delivery - vide Exhibit C in her own handwriting. Much against the will of the petitioner, the petitioner's wife was taken by her mother to Poonganur where she had a miscarriage in consequence of a long and tedious journey. Thereupon the petitioner became very much depressed and brought back his wife by force.

Thereupon Rani Malligammanni preferred a complaint petition to the District Magistrate of Salem, before whom Rani Hiriammanni, while being examined as a prosecution witness admitted during her cross-examination that she was not ill-treated by the petitioner as was also admitted by her before the Sub-Collector of Salem who had been deputed to go to Anekal and make personal enquiries into the matter of the alleged ill-treatment - vide Exhibit D.

Rani Malligammanni, being frustrated in her attempts to take back her daughter Rani Hiriammanni (the petitioner's wife), preferred another complaint (Criminal Case No. 37 of 1897-98) before the 2nd General Assistant Commissioner and First Class Magistrate of Bangalore, against the petitioner for the alleged ill-treatment of Rani Hiriammanni who was living then with the petitioner and her grand-mother Rani Akkajammanni at Anekal, when the said Rani Akkajammanni being examined as a prosecution witness admitted that both Rani Hiriammanni and the petitioner were living under her protection, that the petitioner did not ill-treat his wife Rani

Hiriammanni

Hiriammanni as alleged by her daughter Rani Malligammanni, and that they were living together as husband and wife most amicably -vide Exhibit E, (the deposition of the said Rani Akkajammanni in the aforesaid First Class Magistrate's Court,) ~~for a fresh copy of which~~ An application for a fresh copy was quite recently presented to the said court and the same will be submitted soon after its receipt, the first copy having been lost quite recently at the premises of the Huzur State Treasury Office Building.

Before the petitioner's discharge and while the case was pending its final disposal, the Magistrate directed on the 26th March 1898 that Rani Hiriammanni should remain under the custody of her mother Rani Malligammanni and that she should furnish a security of Ruppes fifty in order to produce her daughter Rani Hiriammanni whenever there was a call from the court. Against this order of security, Rani Malligammanni preferred a Revision Petition to the Chief Court of Mysore to set aside the order of security which was ultimately set aside - vide Exhibit F.

Ever since the order of the 2nd General Assistant Commissioner and First Class Magistrate of Bangalore dated the 26th March 1898 as aforesaid the petitioner's wife, Rani Hiriammanni, had been living under the protection of her mother Rani Malligammanni at Shulagiri and elsewhere while the petitioner and his grandmother Rani Akkajammanni were living at Anekal. But Rani Akkajammanni was in the habit of visiting her daughter's place off and on to see both the daughter and the grand-daughter.

The petitioner's grandmother Rani Akkajammanni after waiting for long 8 years and seeing the obstinate nature

of her daughter (Rani Malligammanni) brought about the second marriage of the petitioner with Rani Lakshmi-devammanni of Tyaranadurga in the Salem District.

As the circumstances stood as narrated above, it can be clearly seen that there was no occasion for the petitioner to ill-treat his wife as she was living with her mother until her mother's death in December 1914, i.e., that Rani Hiriammanni was in the custody of her mother from the 26th March 1898, the date of the Magistrate's order to December 1914. And even if Rani Hiriammanni had stated that she was ill-treated by the petitioner, such statements must have been made just to please her mother Rani Malligammanni while she was under her persuasions.

The memorials to the Government which are supposed to have been addressed by Rani Akkajammanni in the years 1911-13 are, as can be seen, utterly groundless because Rani Akkajammanni in her deposition before the 2nd General Assistant Commissioner and First Class Magistrate as shown above deposed that there was no ill-treatment by the petitioner to Rani Hiriammanni prior to 26-3-1898, the date of the Magistrate's order and after this date Rani Hiriammanni was in the custody of her mother.

Therefore it is quite evident that the so-called memorials to the Government could not have been addressed by Rani Akkajammanni of her own volition. She was illiterate and was in her old age (80 years). Even if the memorials were presented by her, she must have done so knowing them to be a deliberate falsehood, or, without any knowledge of their contents and consequences just to please her daughter. The petitioner begs to state that

Rani

Rani Malligammanni, a sound literate lady, was in the habit of taking Srikaram Marks on false representations from her old mother Rani Akkajammanni to documents, the contents of which, Rani Akkajammanni was not aware of, as can be clearly seen from Rani Akkajammanni's deposition made before the 2nd General Assistant Commissioner and First Class Magistrate of Bangalore -vide Exhibit E.

A few days after the death of Rani Malligammanni in the year 1914, her daughter Rani Hiriammanni repented in the presence of respectable persons who were interested in her welfare, for her past actions for having yielded to the ill-advice of her mother Rani Malligammanni. She solicited the petitioner with repentent tears that she should be forgiven her past actions and that she should be given another opportunity to live with the petitioner as his wife. Accordingly the petitioner being moved with her entreaties forgave her past deeds in the presence of several respectable witnesses and resumed his former relationship with her as her husband until her death in the year 1916 at Bangalore City - vide Exhibit G.

Rani Akkajammanni (grandmother of the petitioner), the petitioner, Rani Hiriammanni (the petitioner's wife), and Rani Chennammanni (daughter of the petitioner's second wife) were all living together at Cottonpet, Bangalore City, for over a year when the petitioner's wife got suddenly ill. In spite of the efficient medical treatment at very great expense at the hands of Dr. Fernandes now residing in Coonoor, Mr.Rajagopala Mudaliar, retired Sub-Assistant Surgeon, Bangalore City, and other native physicians such as Messrs Nanjappa and Sivalingappa of Chikpet, Bangalore City, she succumbed to the disease.

The petitioner then removed her body in a motor car to Anekal for burial in the ancestral burial ground of the petitioner who performed all the religious ceremonies pertaining to his deceased wife. vide Exhibit H.

Rani Akkajammanni died at the petitioner's temporary residence at the village of Tyaaranadurgam on the 2nd October 1918 and the petitioner performed all the necessary ceremonies of the deceased old lady at great expense and he has been performing the anniversaries of both the aforesaid deceased ladies ever since.

Therefore it is quite plain from the above hard facts that there could be no ground for ill-treatment of the petitioner's wife as alleged in the memorials; that everything evil was only manoeuvred by Rani Malligammanni; that the petitioner and his wife Rani Hiriammanni were living as husband and wife soon after the death of Rani Malligammanni and that the spirit of the Government Proceedings was entirely maintained by the petitioner.

Therefore the petitioner most humbly prays that the State Pension of Rs 222-6-10 which is legally and morally due to the petitioner may be kindly ordered to be given to him with effect from its due date as he has been having very hard days and incurred heavy expense owing to various ceremonies of the deceased ladies, and that thereby the liberal policy of the Government in the matter of Pallegars' Pensions enunciated in Government Proceedings Dewan's Camp No.1678/29-10-1887 may be maintained.

For which act of generosity the petitioner shall ever feel grateful.

M. Veeraclikka Poyar

15.5.19

D 3134

SHA.42-46-8

To

J. S. Chakravarti, Esqr.,
Financial Secretary to the Government
of Mysore,
B A N G A L O R E.

The humble petition of ~~Nanja~~ Nanja Royal and Putta Swami Royal, Pollegars of Anekal, Bangalore District.

Most Respectfully Showeth:-

That the petitioners had submitted a petition (vide application A) to the address of the Dewan Sahib, of Mysore, on 8/9/1918, requesting to divide and distribute the pension of their family as was done in the case of the three brothers of the Hagalwadi Pallegars (Vide appendix B. Proceedings of the Mysore Government. N.P.P. 53-4 dated 24th November 1903). For which the Government have been pleased to grant them an order stating that the question of succession or division had not arisen then. (Vide appendix C)

2. That after the death of their grand mother, they again petitioned to the State Huzur Khazana Bhakshi Sahib, on 23/11/18, stating all the particulars of their famil; rights and circumstances regarding the succession and division of their family pension according to Hindu Law.(Vide appendix D).

3. That the petitioner's grand mother Akkajammanni petitioned to the Government regarding the adoption of the family on 6th October 1887. This petition was sent for the report of the then Huzur Khajana Bhakshi. After careful enquiry he has submitted his final report and letter No.10 dated 29th November 1887, fully describing all the

the History of the family and also recommending to recognise the adoption of the father of the petitioners. Accordingly the Government have been pleased to recognise the adoption of their father. (Vide appendix E.) Thus the petitioner's father became the follower and heir for all the properties of the said Akkajammanni.

4. That the petitioner's father had four sons viz., Veerachikka Royaru, (2) Sankara Rayaru, (3) Nanja Rayaru (4) Puttaswami Rayaru.

5. That your honour is well aware that according to Hindu Law all these four sons have equal rights to all the properties of the family and also for the family pension as stated in the Government Proceedings No.1678 dated 29th October 1887. (Vide appendix F.)

6. That in conclusion the petitioners most respectfully request your honor to kindly [redacted] for all the records of the family from the Office of the State Huzur Khazana - Bhakshi and also kindly peruse all the said records and pass orders to divide and distribute the family pension into four equal shares as stated above. (Vide appendix. B, Proceedings of the Government dividing the pension of Hagalwadi Family.)

For which act of kindness and justice petitioners shall ever pray.

Bangalore City,
Dated. 24th May 1919.

Appendix A

To

His Excellency The Dewan of Mysore,

BANGALORE.

The humble petition of P.Sankara Royal, Nanja Royal and Puttaswamy Royal, Pollegars of Anekal, Bangalore District:

Most Respectfully Showeth:

I That the petitioners are the grand sons (Son's Sons) of Chickka Rayar No.I, husband of Akkajammanny (Counter - Petitioner).

II That the said Counter-Petitioner Akkajammanny has put in a petition to the Government on - 9-8-1912 in collusion with one Chikka Rayar No.II who is the brother of the petitioners, in order to deceive these petitioners regarding the pension enjoyed by -- their ancestors from time immemorial.

III That the petitioners are orphans having no mother and father and are entirely depending upon - their grand mother, the said counter petitioner Akkajammanny, who is now of a very old age and isacting according to the words of her ill-advosers.

IV That the petitioners are the victims of the most unfortunate circumstances having no means of - any pecuniary assistance either from their grand mother or from their said brother Chikkarayar No.II.

V. That the petitioners have represented their pitiable case before Your Excellency in person on 29-8-1913.

VI That your petitioners most respectfully pray that Your Excellency may be graciously pleased to divide and distribute the pension of the family of them as was done in the case of the three brothers of the Hagalvadi Pollegars in Government Proceedings No.P.P. 53-4 dated 24th November 1903. (Vide Copy enclosed)

VII That the pension given to the Pollegars is not meant for the maintenance of one member of the family but it is for the maintenance of all the members of such a family and also for education and improvement of the members of the family as is observed in the last part of the Government Proceedings annexed herewith.

VIII That the petitioners' brother Chickka-Rayaru No.II and their grand mother Akkajammanny are trying their best to deceive the petitioners and thus disturb their studies and to enjoy the whole pension without giving a single pie to the petitioners who are the rightful owners and claimants according to both the laws of God and Man.

IX That the petitioners most respectfully pray Your Excellency to kindly peruse the said Government Proceedings passed in a similar case and kindly apply the same in the case of these petitioners who are also on the same level as uterine brothers and rightful claiments for the pension.

X For which act of kindness & justice the petitioners shall ever pray.

P. Sankara Rayal

Registered and Acknowledged on 8/9/1913

Appendix B

Proceedings of the Government of the Maharaja of Mysore.

66600 - 00000

Read:-

Government proceedings No. P-P-118-19 dated 28th January 1914, Directing the Disbursement to Sugandharaj and Chenna Veeraj, of the Hagalvadi Pollegar- family, arrears of pension for six months at Rs. 80/- each out of their family pension, registered in the name of their elder brother Basavalingaraj, pending final orders regarding its division among the three brothers

Also:---

Government proceedings No, P-P-53-4 of the 24th November - 1913, sanctioning a maintenance allowance of Rs. 30/- per mensem in the name of Devammajee , step mother of Basavalingaraj, out of the pension of Rs. 270/- per mensem registered in his name.

Order thereon:- No.139/40 dated 7th March 1904. Deducting the maintenace allowance of Rs. 30/- a month granted to Devammajee, in Government proceedings of the 24th November 1903, read above, a pension of Rs. 240/- per mensem is now enjoyed by Basavalinga Raju for the support of himself and his two brothers Sugandaraj and Chenniveeraj. The latter have petitioned this Office complaining that their brother ha not been paying their shares & praying for the division of the pension equally among the three brothers. And all the brothers who were given a hearing before the Dewan also represent that Devammajee referred to above is not in need of any help out of the family pension and request that the maintenance allowance granted to her may be added to their respective shares.

Appendix C.

No. ... H 5240/50 H 51-12

Government of H. H The Maharaja of Mysore
General and Revenue Secretariat
(S & A.)

Office Memorandum.

To

Dated Bangalore 8th May 19

Endorsement granted to (1) P. Sankarayya
2.) Nanjaraj al. and (3.) Puttasami rayalu, pall
- yars of Anekal of Bangalore districts.

With reference to their petitions dated
5th August 1913 and 8th Sep. 1913 praying
for the division of the Anekal pallegar pension
on the ground of the present pensioner Rani
Akkajammanni Guru having applied to
Government to decide the question of
succession to the pension after her, the
petitioners are informed that their
request cannot be granted as the
question of succession or division of
pension has not arisen now

By Order

For off'g. Secretary to Govern

K. Rs.

Appendix L

Proceedings of the Dewan of Mysore

Read.

Petition dated 6 October 1887 from Devi Kajammanni of the Anekal Paligar family Soliciting permission to adopt a boy for perp of Succession to the family pension.

Letter No: 10 dated 29th November 1888 from the Khazana Bukshy, reporting upon the above petition

Order thereon No 6925-6 dated Bangalore 5th [7th] [687] January 1889

The adoption of Chickarayappa boy of Devi Kajammanni is recognized as valid under the policy enunciated in Proceedings Camp 1678 dated the 29 October 1887 The enjoyment of the Paligar Pension of Rs 148-4- a month by Devi Kajammanni will not hereafter be disturbed during her life time, but after her death it will descend to her adopted son Chickarayappa's eldest Son to whom it is proposed to marry her daughter's daughter

The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore, will be asked to permit the Anekal Paligar family to keep two Chowkidars and 4 peons with Some distinctive badge. to be Madias for Chief peons.

The Khazana Bukshi
The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District with
reference to para 2.

Bangalore Copy 14th September 1889

D 3184

SFA 42-18-6

To

Ragmantra-pravina

Dewan Bhadur J. S. Chakravarthi

M. A. F. R. A. S

Financial Secretary to the Government

of Mysore

Bangalore.

In continuation of his petition dated the 15th may 1919 and in persuance of the directions personally given to him by you on the 28th instant in the matter of furnishing a proof of the fact that his second marriage was performed under the persuasions & explicit wishes of his grand-mother, Rani Akkagammanni, the undersigned petitioner begs to enclose herewith a copy of the orginal letter (Registered postally) which original was kindly perused by you.

The petitioner further begs to state that his second marriage performed with the expressed desire of Rani Akkagammanni as already proved from the above registered letter, should not influence the Government to go beyond their decision of 1889. recognising the petitioner as the only legitimate and rightful heir to succeed to the pension in question

M. Veerackka Rozare

petitioner

30th may 1919

Bangalore city

20.7.1907

బంగళూరు కంటోన్మెంట్

శ్రీ-రా జేఠ్ఠ వీరభద్రయ్యగారి కి నిమ్మ అప్పమ్మల్ల్యాయు వ్రాయునది
అత్యాభిమన్నాయువరు మాండువ ఆశీర్వాదగళ్ళు. శుభయుతు శ్రీలింగాయ
ర ॥ సంగనిన్నతిగాగదశిలపి అభివృద్ధియు వాంఛిసువాళు. నాను ఇల్లిగే బం
సంగతి తిళిసుత్తిరువుదాగి తిళిసువదిల్లా. నాంగ్రహబలవశదల్లి బేసిళిన్నే
మాంతిదాగ్గి శ్రీకాంతు హిరియమ్మన్నాయువన్ను నిన్న పట్టణక్కే కళుహిసువదిల్లవ్వే
డు మల్లిగమ్మన్నాయువరు జీవద్దు కొట్టరే. తన్నమగళు తెన్నల్లాయిలు
బేకేంతా హోళ్ళుకొట్టరే. ఇదు నమ్మదురాదృష్టవేనరి. నన్నజ్జోట్టిదు
ళ్ళారుత్తిదముగళు నన్నమారుతేళ్ళదే నఖిలేనేదు భర్జాదినిగళు
మాడుకొట్టిరుద్దరే. మత్తు హిరియమ్మన్నాయువ్వనిమ్మనియల్లగబే
క్రేంతా హోళ్ళుకొట్టరే, అథవా నీను మల్లిగమ్మన్నాయువ్వనిమ్మనియల్లగబే
తేంతా హోళ్ళుకొట్టరే. ఇదు దొడ్డిగేకాంనిసాళ్ళే ఇదువరిగూ
ఆతేంతు దుభోదనిగళు తేళ్ళువదరల్లి నన్నపింబ-గే మిండసు
మాంతువ ఇరాండే యురూపినని గే తోంటరుత్తే నాను ఇల్లిబిడళ్ళది
నగళు ఇద్దకినమనిక్రేటరుసంభవిసబళుదేంతా తోటరుత్తే. నీవు
ఇన్నమేలాడిహిరియమ్మన్నాయువ్వనిమ్మనియల్లగబేకు ఆళియిల్లవ్వే తొళ్ళిబేక, ఈ
సంగతెన్నాను నినగే మొదలోటిద్దేను. నిన్న బలాత్కారదిం
నాంసుఇ ఇల్లిగే బందదుదక్కే రుమాపప్రయోజనవిల్లా. ఆగలాగ్గే
ఇంగలాదరుం నన్నమాంతు తేళ్ళి బేకిరువుదువేమాడికొం. ఇ
ళ్ళారువవరు నమ్మమూతెనంతే నడిందువరిగూ ఆనీతళ్ళగే బరువహాగిల్లా. నిన్న
రన్నకాయిబీవపగానవిరువవరిగూ ఆనీతళ్ళగే బరువహాగిల్లా. ఈ
సతీయందుదళుతుగనినగేసుమారు 8-9 వరుషగళింద తేంటుంబవిల్లదే ఇ
రుక్తి ఆద్దరింద శ్రీధరణాదుగద్దతేంప్పట్టినవరతెమంతే యిన్నినగేమ
దుబేమళ్ళయినకాళు ఇప్పవిరుక్కే. నన్నఇల్లిబండేసీటనుకొడియబేతూం తే
ం పట్టిన నగేమూంతెదిరుళ్ళబరుప్రదూం. ఆద్దరిందా ఇంతాగదవంతవతనే
నాసునమ్మగు మాచ్చేయు నన్నకాళిరణాదుగద్దతేంప్పట్టినవరతెమంతే యిన్నినగేమ
వన్నేలకానుపంటేవాళ్ళతు మారు. శప్పబేడ. నాను ఈరితంగళ్ళ ఆమ్మరిమ్మనిందు
తేంటనాం. శ్రీధరతే-సరిబిద్దుకొబరువశ్రీధరణామూర్తిద్దమ్మదవేమాంతియిలిరు
బేటమాం. ఈబూతతే-సరిబిల్లదిద్దరే బేరితేంటుమ్మారుపవతన్నితేయుబూతతే-వన్నే
దరూంటకానువంటేవాళ్ళన్నమంతబేకు. నీవునుహిరియమ్మన్నాయువ్వనిమ్మనిలబుమ్మాయు
ఆశ్చేయున్నపరిశీలియ్యబీడిరబేటకు-ఇంతేయుం. శప్పకాశ్మీయుకాలాళ్ళంతర
నిన్నమ్మగే పెంటేబరుతక్కే ఇూనుంగాదవన్నుకిళిస్తుమాం
రుబ్బేనిమ్మదినాయుదవిషయదల్లి బాగ్రతెయుంటిరు. యుక్తిగళ్ళుగాళ్ళరళ్ళి
బేకిత్తే. ఇదేరీతి నంట్టూరు ఉరియుమ్మన్నాయువ్వనిమ్మనియుం మాంతే శేరిగేదురుతో. ఆలతాళ్ళర
ళ్ళిగ్గట్టిగళ్ళుగాళ్ళరళ్ళి పెంబ-గే నన్నను నాళు బరువహాంతరుత్తే నే! అదక్కా
గినిమ్మ బరలువహాగిల్లా. ఆమ్మనయోగదషేవమన్నతేంతూడే బిరి. ఉమ్మా

D 225

To

A.R.Banerji, Esq., M.A., I.C.S.,
Dewan of Mysore, Bangalore.

DIWAN'S OFFICE
Date of Receipt 5.7.19
Petn. Regr. No. 2

Respected sir,

I most humbly beg to request that, as I feel unable to represent my case in a better light, you honour will be kindly pleased to permit me to avail mysel of the services of a legal adviser in representing my gri evances before your honour in the matter of my recent - application to the Government praying for the grant of th monthly State Stipend of the deceased Rani Akkajammanni of the Anekal Pallegar Family in accordance with the - Proceedings of the then Dewan of Mysore (Sir K.Seshadri Iyer) No. 6925-6/667 dated the 5th of February 1889.

I beg to remain,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

M. Veerachikka Royar

No. 49, Zuma Masjid Road,
Bangalore City,
3rd July 1919.

Presented in person by the Advocate Mr. H.V. Narayana Rao.
11.7.19



D.136
S&A 42-18-7

1116

The Government of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

The humble petition of Nanja Rayaru, the Poligar of Anekal, Bangalore District.

Most respectfully showeth:-

One Veerachikka Rayaru was the direct descendant of the Poligars of Anekal. He died without leaving male issue. His widow Rani Akkajiammanni adopted Chikka Rayaru in 1861. This adoption was fully recognised in Government Proceedings No. 6025-6/627, dated 5-2-1889 Bangalore, on the report of State Huzur Khajani Bukshy in his letter No. 10 dated 29-11-1888 Bangalore. The adopted son Chikka Rayaru died about 11 years ago. He left behind him four sons - (1) Veerachikka Rayaru, (2) Shankara Rayaru, (3) Nanja Rayaru, (4) Puttasamy Rayaru. Rani Akkajiammanni died on 2-10-1918. The second brother Shankara Rayaru died on 21-10-1918, leaving behind him three daughters.

After the death of Veerachikka Rayaru, the family pension was registered in the name of Rani Akkajiammanni. She was enjoying the pension of Rs 222-6-2 till her death in 2-10-1918. The ancestral immoveable and moveable properties were divided into four equal portions by a registered partition deed among the four brothers in the life time of the late Rani Akkajiammanni.

While recognising the adoption of late Chikka Rayaru in G.P. No. 6925-6/627 dated 5-2-1889, the Government refused to disturb the pension during her life time. The sons of the adopted son according to the Hindu Law are entitled to divide the said pension and enjoy it separately. The Government of Lysore in G.P. Camp No. 1678 dated 29th October 1887 have laid down that the fundamental principles of the Hindu Law should be strictly adhered to in regard to the questions of pensions of Poligars in the Mysore State. There is absolutely no custom prevailing in the family of Anekal Poligars, recognising the primogeniture. On the other hand, the equal division of the ancestral family properties into four shares among the then four living brothers clearly establishes the absence of primogeniture and the prevailance of the ordinary Hindu Law. A similar question cropped up in the case of Hoalvadi Poligars. The Government N.P.P. 53-4 dated 24-11-1903 have ordered the equal division of pension among three brothers and separate registry thereo vide appendex A.

The petitioner therefore humbly prays that the Government of Mysore may be pleased to order that the above pension of Rs. 222-6-2 of the Anekal Poligar family may be divided into four equal shares among the 4 sons of late Chikkarayam and registered separately, for which act of kindness your humble petitioner ever prays.

H.V. Narayana Rao.
Adv for Petr.

Bangalore,
18th July 1919.

P. Doddaiah

Appendix 'A'

Copy.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Read:-

Government Proceedings No. P-P-118-19 dated 28th January 1904, directing the disbursements to Sugandharaj and Chenniveeraj of the Hagalvadi Poilegar family, arrears of pension for 6 months at ₹ 80/- each out of their family pension, registered in the name of their elder brother Basavalingaraj, pending final orders regarding its division among the three brothers.

Also:-

The Government Proceedings No. P-P-53-4 of the 24th November 1903 sanctioning a maintenance allowance of ₹ 30/- per mensem in the name of Devammajee, stepmother of Basavalingaraj, out of the pension of ₹ 270/- per mensem registered in his name.

ORDER thereon:- No. 139/40 dated 7th March 1904

Deducting the maintenance allowance of ₹ 30/- a month granted to Devammajee in Government Proceedings of the 24th November 1903 read above a pension of ₹ 240/- per mens is now enjoyed by Basavalingaraj, for the support of himself and his two brothers Sugandaraj and Chennaveeraraj. The latter have petitioned this office complaining that their brother has not been paying their shares and praying for the division of the pension equally among the three brothers. All the brothers who were given a hearing before the Dewan also represent that Devammajee referred to above is not in need of any help out of the family pension and request that the maintenance allowance granted

granted to her may be added to their respective shares.

On a careful consideration of the case, the Government of His Highness the Maharaja are pleased to direct that pending further investigation on the petitioners' allegation about Devammajee's circumstances in life the orders already passed shall be duly enforced and that the balance of the pension of Basavalingaraj, after deducting the maintenance allowance due to Devammajee, be equally divided among the three brothers, Basavalingraj, Sugandaraj and Chennaveeraraj, and registered separately in their names.

Opportunity must be availed of by the Officer in charge, State Huzur Treasury to impress upon these pensioners that the continuance of the pension will depend upon their good conduct and respectability and that they must try to improve themselves by education and other ways.

The Huzur Treasury Officer must also use his influence to bring all such stipendiaries to a sense of what is expected of them so as to educate their children and to train them up for some profession or other.



~~In the Court of~~ Before the Government of Mysore

Petition ~~Case~~ No ..... of 1919-20.

Petitioner

Narayanayam

Vs.

I the petitioner above named do hereby nominate and appoint **H. V. Narayana Rao, B. A., L. L. B.,** Advocate, in the above suit and I do hereby empower the said Advocate to appear from and on my behalf in the above suit, to take all and any steps which may be necessary on my behalf arising out of or in connection with the above suit either during progress or after its decision, to sign and subscribe his name to any document which he may deem proper, to execute any decree that may be passed in favour and to receive out of the said Court any sum of money which may be lodged or become payable or receivable on my behalf and on receipt thereof to grant receipt or other sufficient discharges for the same, to withdraw, compromise or refer to arbitration the said suit, to appoint one or more substitute or substitutes and to act and perform all other matters and things relating to or connceted therewith, to represent me in matters relating to the same and to act in the premises as fully and effectually to all intents and purposes as I might do if personally present and did the same. And I do hereby agree to pay all fees, costs, charges and expenses which may be incurred and to allow, ratify, and confirm all and singulalr whatsoever the said Advocate shall lawfully do or cause or procure to be done in the premises by the virtue of these presents.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of July 1919.

P. Doddaiah

ACCEPTED

H.V. Narayana Rao
Advocate for Petr

Signed before me by the executant who is known to me.

Hm

Disposal of

Subject:- ~~Claimants to~~ the pension drawn by the late Akkajammanni of the Anekal Pollegar Family.

Proceedings of the Govt of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read again:-

Government Order No.6925-6/667 dated 5th February 1889 recognising the adoption of Chick Royar as adopted son by Akkajammanni of the Anekal Pollegar Family, ~~and~~ continuing the family pension to her during her life time and declaring that it should descend to her adopted son Chick Royar's eldest son, to whom it was proposed to marry ~~the~~ her daughter's daughter.

2. Correspondence ending with/endorsement No.Fl.4803 dated 15th April 1914 granted to Akkajammanni her daughter Mallijammanni and grand daughters Annijammanni and Stellaiq, that the question of succession to the pension during ~~her~~ the life time of Akkajammanni cannot be re-opened.

PUD II & III

3. Petitions dated 15th May 1919 and 24th May 1919 from (1) M.Veera Chick Royar and (2) P.Nanja Royar and P.Puttusami Royar reporting the death of Akkajammanni on 2nd October 1918 and personally pressing their claims to the vacant pension.

PUD-I

4. Correspondence ending with letter No.33/63 dated 21st April 1919 from the Comptroller to Government reporting on the ~~several~~ claimants of the Petitioners to the vacant

pension and recommending that in the ~~special~~ circumstances of the case the pension should lapse to Government.

Order No. Je 1176
Dated Bangalore 14 August 19

After carefully considering the circumstances of the case and the -- claims of the petitioners, Government a pleased to direct that the vacant -- Pollegar pension of the Anekal Family of Rs.222-6-10 be registered in the name of the eldest heir Veerachicka Royar but with the direction that he should divide the pension equally -- between himself and his xxx two brothe Nanja Royar and Puttuswami Royar with effect from 3rd October 1918.

26-7-19

25/7/19
Financial Secretary to Govt.

To

The Comptroller, Mysore Govt.

24/7

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to... 01-D 3134

Section SM

File No. 42-18

Serial No. 9

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(SM)

the 191 .

Date of issue.....30 Augt 19.....

Signed by.....

No. M 1654

Dated 30 August 19

To

M. R. Ry P. Nanja Royar &
P. Puttuswami Royar.
Anekal Pallivar Family
— Petitioners — Anekal

With reference to their petitions
of 26. XI. 18 & 24. 5. 19 respectfully
praying for the distribution
of the Pallivar Penkan Dasam by
late Akkajammanni in
equal Shares to all the Brothers
etc, the petitioners are
informed

over.

1-5

M/578

informed that Govt. in their
Proceedings No 7C.1176/SM 42-18-8
dy 14.8.19 have directed 222-6-10
that the Vacant pension be
registered with effect from 3rd
October 1918 in the name of
the elder ~~son~~ heir — Veera
Chikkka Rayar that he
should divide the pension
equally between himself
& ~~two~~ his two brothers — the
petitioners.

B.O.

for Secretary

W
22/8

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by.

WD 1744—GPB—80,000—19-3-19

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to... 3134
3184

(2 dfts)

Section SM.
File No. 42-18
Serial No. 10

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT
(SM)
the 191

No. R 1655
& 30 August 19 10
with Encls.

Date of issue.....30 Aug/19.....

Signed by.....

To

M. R. Rs. Dr. Vera Chickka
- Reps. Anekal Pallegar
Petitioner, Anekal

with reference to his petition
& 15.5.19 & 30.5.19 praying
for the continuance of the Vacci
tution of Rs. 222-6-10 drawn by
late adopted mother - Nekkajam
-mani etc, The petitioner is
informed that Govt in G.O. No.
1176/SM. 42-18-8 & 14.8.19 have
directed

over.

Rs. 4 & 6

29/8/19

The Vacant pensions be registered,
~~have issued~~ with effect from
3. X. 18, in the name of the eldest heir — the
petitioner — that he should
divide the pension equally between
himself & his two brothers,
P. ~~Shanker~~ Ranga Royar & P.
Puthuswami Royar —

2. The enclosures are returned herewith.

B.O.

for S.C. Secretary.

11/8
W8

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

W. & A.H. Gp. 33 30,000 19-3-19